

REMARKS:

Claims 1-4, 18, 27, 31, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 53, 69, 70, 72, 73 and 83 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The Applicant and the undersigned sincerely thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of October 5, 2007 and the useful suggestions for better defining the invention.

The independent Claims 1, 18, 36 and 69 have all be amended to include features from canceled Claim 15, and to better define the corner structure shown in Fig. 33A and descried in the specification at pages 14 and 15.

The “ending plate” 122 is now defined as having a “Z-shaped interlocking section” or “Z-shaped portion” 142 and a “planar outside panel plate” 141 that extends from the Z-shaped portion and into the corner, and that has no flange as shown in Fig. 33A, and that overlaps the flange portion 135 of the “starting panel” 121. This allows the ending panel 122 to be any width so that buildings of any dimension can be made with the invention. The claims also now define a plurality of fasteners for connecting the panels together.

The overall number of claims has also been reduced to satisfy the 5/25 rule that comes into effect on November 1, 2007.

No new matter has been added.

It is believed that the combination of Maschak (U.S. Patent 5,117,602), Hoefen (U.S. Patent 2,186,310) and Gartner (U.S. Patent 4,532,746) that was cited as rendering Claim 15 obvious, would not render the newly presented claims obvious. Among other things, neither Hoefen nor any of the other references used differently shaped ending and starting panels, where the ending panel has the claimed flange-free planar outside panel plate that overlaps the flanged end of the starting panel and where this overlapping structure is further covered from the outside by the outside L-shaped panel 126 in Fig. 33A of the present application. Hoefen does not have any of these structures so that the person of ordinary skill in this art using the Z-shaped portions of Marschak with the insulation of

Gartner and the corner of Hoefen has still not reached the claimed invention in any obvious manner.

In addition, none of the three combined references have the thermal barrier slit configuration shown in Fig. 4 and defined in Claim 1 as:

“...each wall panel edge portion having a side panel section with two spaced apart vertical rows of staggered slits or slots with gaps between slits or slots of one row aligning with slits or slots of the other row for retarding heat transfer across each side panel section...” (Claim 1, lines 6-9).

The prior art combination does not provide this missing structure.

Claim 36 has a similar limitation at feature “f)” of the claim.

Claim 69 also includes another limitation that is not present in any of the prior art references so that their combination cannot supply this missing limitation, namely the water drainage feature illustrated in Fig. 18 and defined in Claim 69 as:

“...the lower longitudinal beam having a web that rests upon the slab and an outer flange having at least one L-shaped slot therein that extends partly to the web for draining water from the lower beam...” (Claim 69, lines 5-7).

The remaining claims further distinguish the invention so that the application and claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Dated: October 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/PETER C. MICHALOS/

Peter C. Michalos
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 28,643
Tel. 845-359-7700

PCM:pae

NOTARO & MICHALOS, P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, NY 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706